

REMARKS

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.111, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claim rejections set forth in the Office action dated January 17, 2007.

Summary

Claims 1 – 58 are pending in the application.

Claims 1 – 10, 13 – 27, 32 – 39, 42 – 46 and 48 – 50 were rejected.

Claims 11 – 12, 28 – 31, 40 – 41, 47, and 51 – 58 were withdrawn.

Election/Restrictions

Applicants acknowledge the election of Group A, which corresponds to at least claims 1 – 10, 13 – 27, 32 – 39, 42 – 46 and 48 – 50, made by the Examiner in the Office action dated January 17, 2007.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 4 – 10, 18, 21 – 27, 35, 37 – 39, 45 – 46, and 48 – 50 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sawasaki et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0043326A1). Claims 2 – 3, 19 – 20 and 36 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawasaki et al. and in view of Shin (U.S. Patent No. 5,825,449). Claims 13 – 17, 32 – 34 and 42 – 44 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawasaki et al. and in view of Song (U.S. Patent 6,307,602).

Amended Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a thickness of the light-shielding color filter patterns are equal to or less than a thickness of the color filter.

Sawasaki et al. fail to disclose or suggest a thickness of the light-shielding color filter patterns are equal to or less than a thickness of the color filter. The Examiner cites CF layer R as the color filter (Office action dated January 17, 2007; page 7). The Examiner cites the common electrode substrate 10 and the glass substrate 12 as the light shielding color filter patterns (Office action dated January 17, 2007; page 7-8). Under the Examiner's interpretation, Sawasaki et al. fail to teach any relationship between the CF layer R and the common electrode substrate

10 or the glass substrate 12. Also, under the Examiner's interpretation, as shown in Figure 23, glass substrate 12 is substantially larger than the CF layer R. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over the cited reference.

Dependent claims 2 – 10 and 13 – 17 depend from allowable claim 1, so are allowable for at least this reason.

Independent claims 18, 35, and 46 recite features that are substantially similar to those discussed above for allowable claim 1, and are allowable for reasons that are similar to those discussed above. Dependent claims 19 – 27, 32 – 34, 36 – 39, 42 – 45, and 48 - 50 depend from an allowable base claim, so are allowable for at least this reason.

CONCLUSION

The Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons given above, the application is in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned in the event that a telephone interview would expedite consideration of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Gustavo Siller, Jr./
Gustavo Siller, Jr.
Registration No. 32,305
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200